

## REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated June 20, 2008. In view of the foregoing amendments and following representations, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

By the above amendments, claims 1 and 2 are amended. Accordingly, claims 1-18 are currently pending in the present application.

Initially, as per the Examiner's request, the specification and abstract have been reviewed and revised in order to make a number of minor clarifying and other editorial amendments. To facilitate entry of the revisions, a substitute specification and abstract has been prepared. No new matter has been added. Also enclosed is a "marked-up" copy of the original specification and abstract to show the changes that have been incorporated into the substitute specification and abstract. The enclosed copy is entitled "Version with Markings to Show Changes Made."

On page 2 of the Office Action, the drawings are objected to because reference numeral "30" is used to describe different elements. In response, the specification has been amended to clarify that reference numeral "30" represents the dielectric member while reference numeral "70" represents the conductive member. For example, paragraph [0049] has been amended to correctly indicate that reference numeral 30 identifies the dielectric member. Also, paragraph [0135] has been amended to clarify that the reference numeral 70 identifies the conductive member. Further, replacement drawings are submitted herewith in order to label Figs. 43 and 44 "Prior Art".

Next, on pages 3-4 of the Office Action, claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. In response, claim 1 has been amended to include the substance of the

Examiner's interpretation of the original claim language. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 1-18 are now clearly in compliance with the provisions of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112.

Next, on pages 4-5 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that claims 1-18 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. As indicated above, claim 1 has been amended to include the language considered to be allowable by the Examiner. Therefore, claims 1-18 are now allowable for at least the reasons set forth by the Examiner in the previous Office Action.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the present application is now clearly in condition for allowance. The Examiner therefore is requested to pass this case to issue.

In the event that the Examiner has any comments or suggestions of a nature necessary to place this case in condition for allowance, then the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney by telephone to promptly resolve any remaining matters.

Respectfully submitted,

Yoko MATSUBAYASHI et al.

By: 

Michael S. Huppert  
Registration No. 40,268  
Attorney for Applicants

MSH/kjf  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
September 22, 2008